

REMARKS

Claims 18-37 are presently in the application.

Claims 18-37 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 18 has been amended to clarify the language of the claims. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-37 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Takeda (U.S. 5,918,818).

Claim 18 is directed to a magnet valve for actuating a fuel injector, comprising a magnet core (2), *a magnet coil (3) received within an annular recess (24) of the magnet core (2)*, a closing spring (9) disposed within a bore (6) of the magnet core (2), the closing spring biasing an armature plate (11) of a magnet armature (10) to close the magnet valve, fuel outlet openings (18, 35) being formed between the armature plate (11) and the magnet core (2), *an armature bounce reducing damping face (20) applied adjacent to the magnetic coil within the annular recess (24) of the magnet core (2)*, and a hydraulic damping chamber (31) defined by one end face (12) of the magnet armature (10) on the armature plate (11) and by the armature bounce reducing damping face (20), said fuel outlet openings(18, 35) respectively discharging fuel into and out of said hydraulic damping chamber, *and wherein the damping face (20) is comprised of a non-magnetic material (16)*.

Takeda lacks the structural arrangement of the invention, where an annular recess 24 in the magnet core receives the magnet coil 3, where the annular recess 24 is provided with

Appl. No. 10/538,915
Amdt. dated November 2, 2007
Reply to Office action of August 2, 2007

the damping face 20 to reduce the armature bounce, and that the damping face 20 is provided directly on the magnetic coil 3, and with respect to claim 21 is also provided on the magnetic core 2, as illustrated collectively in Figs. 2, 3, and 6.

There is no mention in Takeda of creation of a hydraulic damping face that reduces bounce. In Takeda, the face is merely a stopper. There is no teaching or suggestion of bounce reducing according to the invention in the reference.

To support a rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), it must be shown that each element of the claim is found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference. See Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp., 713 F.2d 760, 772, 218 USPQ 781, 789 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 465 U.S. 1026 (1984).

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Entry of the amendments and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Ronald E. Greigg / James A. Baer
Ronald E. Greigg
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,517
CUSTOMER NO. 02119
Re: # 20893

GREIGG & GREIGG, P.L.L.C.
1423 Powhatan Street, Suite One
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 838-5500
Fax. (703) 838-5554

REG/JAK/ja
J:\Bosch\R303599-1\Reply to 08-02-07 FINAL OA.doc